

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, JULY 14, 2015**

The Glastonbury Town Council with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson, in attendance, held a Final Budget Hearing and Regular Meeting at 7:00 p.m. in Council Chambers of the Town Hall located at 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury, Connecticut.

1. Roll Call

Council Members

Dr. Stewart Beckett III, Chairman
Mr. Whit C. Osgood, Vice Chairman
Mrs. Jill Barry
Ms. Karen Boisvert
Mr. Lawrence J. Byar
Mr. Kurt P. Cavanaugh
Mr. William T. Finn
Mr. Thomas P. Gullotta
Mrs. Cara (Tonucci) Keefe

a) Pledge of Allegiance

Led by Mr. Cavanaugh

2. Public Comment.

(a) Donation of Fitness Trail – Peter P. Monaco Detachment, Marine Corps League.

Mr. Johnson reviewed his memo to the Council dated July 10, 2015, explaining that the group will come in at the next meeting and there used to be something similar at the High School. He continued to say they have offered to donate it on the trail between Smith School and Bell Street and he personally thought it would be a good addition. He said that they would work with staff to be sure locations are appropriate. He circulated a booklet with options for the equipment.

Chairman Beckett asked for public comment but no one spoke.

3. Special Reports.

None

4. Old Business.

(a) Discussion concerning fuel cell project – landscaping, sound and color(s).

Mr. Johnson reviewed his memo to the Council dated July 10, 2015, explaining that when the town realized the fuel facility location was not where it was proposed, the town submitted requests to the Connecticut Siting Council, who have sole jurisdiction over the fuel cell facility, for site restoration, effort to mask the facility with color and landscaping, mitigation for noise and donations to the town's land acquisition fund. He said the Siting Council supported all except the last conveying that they didn't feel they had the authority to do that. He said they did a site visit with Members of the Town Council and Beautification to help put together the plan. He continued saying that faux walls were considered but ultimately, most felt it would be better to integrate the facility into the site as best they could instead of risking drawing more attention to it by increasing size and scope. He reviewed the proposed plan saying that the neighbors at the meetings voiced support for the plantings and black vinyl chain link fence. He noted they may have limited options for the color of the facility. He continued saying that the noise studies are based on theoretical modules and the proposal allows residents quite a bit of time to experience the noise and seek more mitigation. He added the landscape plan includes provisions for invasive species and maintenance.

Mr. Byar asked about the neighbor support. Mr. Johnson conveyed their support and said they invited all neighbors within 500' and asked them to spread the word for each of their sessions which had attendance of about 10-12 residents. Mr. Byar was pleased to hear of the support of the neighbors and setting aside that it shouldn't have come to this, he expressed support. Mr. Finn praised Beautification and the plan noting the large size of the specimens. He asked if the color was for the stacks or the whole facility. Mr. Johnson said that the recommendation was for the green color for everything but there was a concern expressed that paint could be vulnerable by areas subjected to heat. Mr. Finn suggested that they ensure the surfaces are properly prepared so they don't accidentally add to the eyesore with peeling paint. He appreciated the effort that went into the proposal to accommodate the neighbors and expressed support of the plan.

Mr. Gullotta said that the contractor would probably resist the color change. He continued saying that he favored the New England Tobacco Barn over the whole thing but will support the plan that the neighbors favored. He said that he would like to keep the door open to revisit this in the future similar to how the noise issue as being addressed. Vice Chairman Osgood said that the action is to support the landscaping plan and with the neighbor's support, he also expressed support. Ms. Boisvert confirmed with Mr. Johnson that the 18 month period is only for noise mitigation and asked who would monitor. Mr. Johnson said that the town would be the monitor with the input from the neighbors.

Motion By: Mr. Cavanaugh **Seconded By:** Mr. Gullotta
BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby supports the recommendations concerning site restoration and landscaping, noise and color scheme for the fuel cell constructed at 1835 Hebron Avenue, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated July 10, 2015, and authorizes the Town Manager to present such recommendations to the CT Siting Council.
Result: Motion passes unanimously {9-0-0}.

5. New Business.

(a) Action on waiver of Request for Qualifications – Professional Services – Riverfront Park – geotechnical services.

Mr. Johnson reviewed his memo to the Council dated July 10, 2015, explaining that this firm served the town well as they sought to understand the issue and that it seems to make sense to continue with the oversight of the project. Vice Chairman Osgood added that they are working under very tight time frames and need very specific qualifications. Mr. Gullotta asked what services they would be providing. Mr. Johnson reviewed the project again indicating this contractor's involvement with the analysis and development of the solution and starting Monday would be oversight of the execution of the rip rap in the water.

Motion By: Mr. Cavanaugh **Seconded By:** Mr. Gullotta
BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves a waiver of the competitive Request for Qualifications process for geotechnical services for the Riverfront Park Project, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated July 10, 2015.

Result: Motion passes unanimously {9-0-0}.

(b) Discussion concerning Council protocols in matters pending before the CT Siting Council.

Mr. Finn noted that there were two issues before the Council that involved intervenor status and the CT Siting Council and he felt they would be well served by establishing a protocol. Ms. Boisvert agreed saying she felt the process was awkward to manage and unclear to the Council and the residents. Mrs. Keefe agreed noting that it would be helpful to have a process when they receive a letter from the Siting Council. Mr. Byar said he didn't disagree but felt this was best researched by a subcommittee. Mr. Gullotta noted that this Council will expire in five months and a future Council may not agree adding that the messiness of the process given every situation is different, and the involvement of the public is not necessarily a bad thing. Mr. Finn agreed that they would never want to discourage public participation in the process.

Vice Chairman Osgood noted that there are two issues, 1) whether they take intervenor status which he felt was a case by case basis, and then 2) what they do when they get notice from the Siting Council including how they keep the public informed. Mrs. Barry felt each case was different and should be looked at independently. Mrs. Keefe agreed there were different issues saying that they also need to know what to do when they pursue intervenor status so the right people are looking at it, they know what's going on with the application and understand the statutes and regulations. Chairman Beckett expressed concern about setting up a process that requires undo effort and results in spending more money than they otherwise would choose if they had evaluated it independent of a formal process. He asked Mrs. Keefe and Mr. Finn to work with Mr. Johnson on a recommendation to address Siting Council communications.

(c) Action on easement for natural gas line – CNG.

Mr. Johnson reviewed his memo to the Council dated July 10, 2015, and reviewed the map. Mr. Byar asked about disruption to the ball fields and restoration. Mr. Johnson said that they would coordinate the project and ensure restoration.

Motion By: Mr. Cavanaugh **Seconded By:** Mr. Gullotta
BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes the Town Manager to execute a formal Easement Agreement for installation of a natural gas service line on town-owned property at Buckingham Park as described in a report by the Town Manager dated July 10, 2015.

Result: Motion passes unanimously {9-0-0}.

6. Consent Calendar.

None

(a) Action on General Fund Transfer – Natural Gas Fueled Vehicles (refer to Board of Finance; set public hearing).

Motion By: Mr. Cavanaugh **Seconded By:** Mr. Gullotta
BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers to the Board of Finance the request for a \$74,000 transfer from the General Fund-Unassigned Fund Balance to Town Capital Outlay accounts for purchase of grant-funded vehicles and systems equipment as described in a report by the Town Manager dated July 10, 2015, and schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, July 28, 2015 to consider the proposed transfer. Said public hearing to be held subject to a favorable Board of Finance report and recommendation.

Result: Motion passes unanimously {9-0-0}.

7. Town Manager's Report.

Mr. Johnson reviewed his report to the Council dated July 10, 2015, noting the river work starting on Monday, the pending projects and the motor vehicle tax, municipal revenue sharing and spending cap. Mr. Byar asked if the spending cap included both the town and Board of Education. Mr. Johnson said that they don't have any real definition of municipal spending. Mr. Byar questioned how many years they would have come under the cap and felt it was ridiculous to impose on the Town of Glastonbury which is AAA rated. Chairman Beckett said that he thought infrastructure was exempt. Mr. Johnson said that he would double check. Chairman Beckett noted regarding town center parking that a great deal of time and attention has been paid to the subject with studies, workshops and committees. Mrs. Barry praised the library staff with their support of self-checkout.

8. **Committee Reports.** *None*
(a) **Chairman's Report.**
9. **Communications.**
- (a) **Letter from CT Siting Council re modification of communication facility located at Hebron Avenue.**
- (b) **Letter from CT Siting Council re Eversource request to modify its existing Hopewell Substation on Chestnut Hill Road.**
- (c) **CT Siting Council notice of meeting on various topics including proposed installation of a small cell communications facility on roof of building located at 278 Oakwood Drive.**
- (d) **Letter from SpectraEnergy regarding status of Atlantic Bridge Project (Algonquin Gas).**
- (e) **Letter from CRCOG Policy Board re member benefits.**
- (f) **Correspondence from Attorney Kenneth Baldwin re proposed modifications to telecommunications facility at 58 Montano Road.**
- (g) **Correspondence from Glastonbury Chamber of Commerce regarding revisiting the parking study for the Town Center**

10. **Minutes**

- (a) **Minutes of June 23, 2015 Council Meeting.**

Motion By: Mr. Cavanaugh **Seconded By:** Mr. Gullotta
BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes as submitted for the regular meeting held June 23, 2015.

Result: Motion carries by the following vote { 8-0-1 }

Favor: Chairman Beckett, Mr. Cavanaugh, Ms. Boisvert, Mr. Byar, Mr. Cavanaugh, Mr. Finn, Mr. Gullotta and Mrs. Keefe

Opposed: *None*

Abstain: Mrs. Barry {*excused*}

11. Appointments and Resignations.

None

PUBLIC INFORMATION HEARING – 8:00 P.M.

NO. 1 PROPOSED OPTIONS FOR THE REALIGNMENT OF THE INTERSECTIONS OF HEBRON AVENUE AT NEW LONDON TURNPIKE, AND HEBRON AVENUE AT HOUSE STREET.

Mr. Johnson reviewed his memo to the Council dated July 10, 2015, explaining that this hearing is regarding the traffic handling at two intersections, Hebron Avenue with both New London Turnpike and House Street. Dan Pennington, Town Engineer, reviewed the plans saying that the town owns Hebron Avenue from Sycamore to Main Street. He reviewed in some detail, the congestion issue at New London Turnpike and the safety issue at House Street. He said that New London Turnpike must be fixed first and two solutions are being considered, a traditional intersection and a roundabout. He continued saying that for the traditional intersection, it would require a minor amount of widening to allow for an exclusive right turn lane.

He reviewed the plans for signalization at New London Turnpike saying that they would be consistent with Main Street improvements and that they were complete and ready to bid. He said that the second option at New London Turnpike was a small, urban 100' roundabout within the right-of-way but the sidewalks would require an easement. He noted that the pedestrian crossings are offset from the intersection with a splitter island serving as an area of refuge. He noted that the roundabout has an apron to allow the back wheels of an 18 wheeler truck to ride up as they move through the roundabout. The small size of the roundabout limits the aesthetic treatment but is operationally functional. He said that he was confident if chosen, this solution would reduce delay.

Regarding the roundabout proposed for House Street, it is skewed so there would be no impact to current properties. He noted the development application was approved anticipating the proposed roundabout. He said that the State has opposed a light at House Street because they fear there would be a back-up on Route 2. Chairman Beckett said that while the town owns and maintains that area, the State has jurisdiction over signals. Mr. Pennington emphasized that the roundabouts are conceptual plans and that regardless of the chosen solutions, the New London Turnpike intersection must be done first. He added that Pedestrian and Bike Safety can be addressed with a roundabout. Chairman Beckett said that they had a representative from the DOT speak at their last meeting which was very enlightening on modern roundabouts with facts that oppose common thought.

Mr. Christopher Granatini of Tighe & Bond, explained that with a traditional intersection, you have to look both ways and cross two to three lanes of traffic but with a roundabout, pedestrians cross only one lane at a time with traffic moving only one direction. He added that furthermore, the traffic is moving 15 to 20 miles per hour at most where traffic will move 35 to 40 miles per hour through a traditional intersection. He said that bicycles have room to ride with traffic or can

move with the pedestrians. He noted that with a small acquisition, the roundabout could be enlarged to allow for more aesthetic treatment. Mr. Gullotta noted that the representative from the DOT had spoken to the lack of pedestrian deaths with roundabouts where there were three per day for traditional intersections. Mr. Granatini endorsed that information as accurate saying roundabouts are definitely safer with less incidents and a reduced severity for incidents that do occur.

Mrs. Keefe asked about the length of the construction time and impact to the businesses. Mr. Pennington said that construction for a roundabout is complicated and they haven't done detailed plans but that it could be three to seven phases maintaining traffic through the area and therefore, could last an entire season from April to November. Mr. Granatini said that House Street would likely be much less because of the offset proposed for the roundabout. Ms. Boisvert confirmed that only the 18 wheelers, and not smaller trucks, would require use of the apron in the roundabout. Ms. Boisvert asked how frequently tractor trailers go through the intersection. Mr. Pennington did not have data but said that currently, the 18 wheelers struggle with turns through the intersections. Chairman Beckett questioned whether they should prohibit trucks but Mr. Pennington said that the DOT does not grant that designation easily.

Mrs. Barry questioned if a car stopping for a pedestrian could back up traffic into the roundabout. Mr. Granatini said that it could but conservatively, it takes a pedestrian 4 seconds to cross a leg so there wouldn't be a significant delay. Mr. Pennington noted that pedestrian crossing would activate the signal and cause a delay with a traditional intersection as well. Mr. Finn questioned if it made sense to lay out the roundabout in a parking lot and test an 18 wheeler so they can make a better decision about acquiring space. Mr. Pennington said that they ran the intersection through the models which tend to be conservative and the use of the apron is typical and expected. He said that avoiding the use of the apron by the largest trucks would create too much space such that traffic would feel more comfortable increasing their speed. He said that if it were increased a little, it would allow for an aesthetic improvement.

Mr. Granatini agreed saying a modest increase would allow for aesthetic improvements and make it easier to traverse but wouldn't make it so big that they wouldn't make use of the apron. He also said that the software models work well and are conservative so that if it works in the software, it definitely works in real life. Mr. Finn said he'd like to know how much bigger would be helpful. Mrs. Keefe questioned sight and hearing impaired pedestrians. Mr. Granatini said that pedestrians are directed to a crosswalk and landscape barriers help prevent people from walking through the middle of a roundabout. He continued speaking to the improved safety of a roundabout.

Mr. Joshua Gotfried, of 340 Hebron Ave said that traffic has increased in the last 5.5 years he has watched and due to the overall congestion, traffic has increased on House to avoid it. He questioned if there was any analysis to how House Street would improve once New London Turnpike was fixed and if they prohibit a left turn out of House Street.

Mr. Fill Swiconek of 27 Garland Drive said that with a single lane in and out of the roundabout, he feels like there would still be congestion and there would be confusion. He also expressed concern about snow removal and said that he has had to back-up at New London Turnpike to allow a truck to make a turn. He also questioned no left turn out of House Street. He questioned whether hiring someone to direct traffic a couple hours each night might solve the problem. He said that speed is not much of a concern as there is nowhere to go when it is peak time. He questioned if there was a state law about how long it takes to get through an intersection as they could have an issue.

Mr. Jim Boice of 274 Spring Street Extension said he wasn't against roundabouts but didn't think this was a good place for them. He said that they are fairly new to the United States and there is very little research that has been done on their effectiveness. He continued saying that they are better for rural neighborhood applications. He urged the Council to look beyond these one or two intersections and ensure that they wouldn't be moving a problem to another intersection. He questioned if the current difficulty making a left out of Welles will be impossible after these improvements. He said that he would have loved to have had a workshop where ideas could be shared and expressed concern about the plaza adjacent New London Turnpike with Dunkin Donuts. He said that he would like to see the roundabout bigger if they are going to do it. He emphasized that in a signalized intersection, the pedestrian is told when to cross but with a roundabout, it becomes their decision adding that the elderly would be both driving and walking. He noted that this is like major surgery and urged the town to get a second opinion.

Mrs. Debra DeVries Dalton of 188 Woodhaven Road expressed support saying that the town would benefit from one or more roundabouts. She represented the Glastonbury Town Center Initiative and she is also a member of an engineering firm. She said that roundabouts are one of things they have in their traffic calming bag of tricks. She repeated the statistics that show that roundabouts have reduced incidents and reductions in severity including fatalities because of the reduced speed. She continued saying fatalities occur at 30 to 35 miles per hour and the roundabout reduces speeds are 15 to 20 miles per hour. She said that there is no light to beat and traffic is only going one way so there is no head on or t-bone collisions reiterating that it is safer for motor vehicles and pedestrians. She said that over the long term, there is no maintenance like there would be for signalization and it functions when there is a power outage. She continued saying that a roundabout takes up less space overall since there is less space needed to accommodate cues. Because people feel safer, they are more likely to walk and visit the businesses. Lastly, she said that she had personal experiences with many roundabouts overseas and found them safe and effective.

Mr. Richard Perkett of 311 Hebron Avenue said he was very frustrated with the safety issue in that area and while he didn't know if a roundabout was the answer, he felt it would severely impede access to his business. He said that as it is, it is often blocked up by cues now. He said he is for it if it is safer as long as he could get to his business.

Mr. CJ Mozzochi of 227 Hebron Avenue expressed support for both roundabouts saying that there are also a lot of accidents at Concord Street. He noted that there shouldn't be parking allowed in front of 217 Hebron Avenue and explained that the Chief of Police required him to remove parking there when he owned the building 26 years ago. He handed the Council Members a video and letter and asked them to review the information and see if they agree.

Mr. Ronald Gattinella of 208 Lincoln Street expressed support of the roundabouts saying that they would calm cars off exit 8. He noted that cars will find another route when an area is congested. He said that he understands the developer is willing to install an island on House Street but suggested the town beat him to it.

Ms. Donna Donovan of 260 Hebron Avenue, Apt D, 2nd Floor said she grew up in New Jersey that was full of traffic circles and rotaries but they have taken some down now. She said that she has a hard time getting out of the apartment complex. She expressed concern with school children coming off the school bus and with consistent traffic through the roundabout, there won't be a break to allow for crossing. She questioned how emergency vehicles would be impacted and felt tractor trailers would make things harder. She said that she doesn't see too many bikes. She said she would rather not deal with traffic circles because of safety for children and older people but would rather see crosswalks and traffic signals.

Mr. Mike Lonergan of 64 Robin Road said he wasn't against the roundabouts but wanted to ensure the town is looking at a more comprehensive picture of the whole area, for instance, Main Street, how about a roundabout there, too. He said that the town would need to educate drivers, older and younger drivers, and questioned what would be done with the snow. He said that nobody stops for pedestrians and these sidewalks would have to be a priority. He expressed concern for pedestrian safety when there was free flowing traffic and no hard stop. He hated the thought of the town putting it in and taking it out. He suggested a good place for a roundabout is Manchester Road and Hebron Avenue.

Mrs. Rachel Blatt of 47 Pine Hurst said she was involved in the Town Center Initiative and do think a walkable community is important particularly at the center. She said that there is a major difference in fatality rates, at 20 mph it is 5% but at 40 mph, it is 80%. She explained their program where they dressed in chicken suits and stood by a crosswalk but still could not get people to stop and let them cross. She suggested a raised crosswalk to help with visibility and ease of plowing but added that it also acts as a speed hump. She also suggested that the town increase the width of the sidewalks, 5' allows a wheelchair and 6' allows two strollers side by side. She urged the town to work with the business community and also consider a shuttle. She echoed the idea for a comprehensive approach.

Mr. Jerry Satin, 9-11 Linden and 101 Clinton, favored roundabouts but was critical that there were no sidewalks on his road and it is used as a cut through. He was concerned for safety and worried that the roundabouts would cause more cut through traffic.

Mr. Al Dion of 32 Crossroads Lane said he moved to the Glen Lochen Condos to be a walker but is afraid to walk due to the traffic. He said that the studies do say that roundabouts are safer for pedestrians but the caveat is that they are uncertain if the pedestrians are avoiding the roundabouts being concerned about finding a gap.

Ms. Kathy Ruane of 366 Hebron Avenue said the traffic was bad and customers won't come because of issues with Linden. She said that she worries that there would be no break with a traffic circle and that at least there is a break with a traditional traffic signal. She suggested they do more lanes at New London Turnpike and see how that improves the project before going forward. She noted that taking a left out of Linden is also difficult.

Ms. Diane Kittle of 120 Lincoln Drive and business owner at Hebron and Sycamore noted that Mr. Granatini said to take the DOT speaker from the previous meeting seriously and then noted that he had advocated for a 110' minimum for the roundabout instead of the 100' as proposed. She said that with two proposals, there had only been discussion of the roundabout. She said that as a businessperson, she is very concerned about the length of construction. She asked how long it would take to do New London Turnpike and what commitments were made to the House Street property owner.

Mr. Pennington said that the no left turn out of House Street with the raised channelized island is viewed as an interim solution, not long term. Regarding snow removal, he said that they would have to remove the snow from the apron and sidewalks but he was confident they could handle it. Regarding driveways in the vicinity of the intersection, regardless of the chosen solution, they will be a challenge. He said that there wouldn't be a restriction of left turns onto Linden and that those issues would be considered in a separate project. Mr. Granatini said that modern roundabouts are different from traffic circles and rotaries which tend to be larger and higher speeds. He said that modern roundabouts are not solutions for every intersection but Tighe & Bond studied the feasibility for these two intersections. He reiterated that roundabouts are traffic calming devices unlike traffic circles or rotaries. He added that the design process is critical to lay out the geometry.

Chairman Beckett asked about the testimony of 110' for the size of the roundabout. Mr. Granatini said that they completed the study with the charge to fit the roundabout within the right away. He continued the 110' roundabout would be more comfortable for larger vehicles but a larger diameter would require the taking. Mr. Satin said he favored roundabouts but wanted consideration of the issues at Clinton and Linden. Mr. Perkett asked about the raised island on House and Mr. Pennington explained. Ms. Donovan questioned the notice as many people didn't know about the meeting. Mr. Johnson explained that property owners within 500' were notified.

Mr. Tom Riley of 120 Lincoln said that people use House Street to avoid a congested area or will pull a U-turn. He said that regarding no sidewalks, Neipsic is very dangerous.

Mr. Bernie Leak of 14 Hubbard expressed concern about the parking and driveway into the plaza with Dunkin Donuts and Webster Bank.

Ms. Kettle said she was not notified, perhaps notices went to property owners and not tenants.

Mr. Joan Marken of Sycamore Street spoke to the speed of traffic in the area.

Mr. John Ruber of 111 Hebron Ave said he came to the hearing with an open mind, emphasized there is a traffic issue as it is nearly impossible to take a left turn. He continued saying that at least when there is a traffic light, there is a break.

Mr. Dennis McDermott of 21 Wrights Lane said that there is a new roundabout in Cape Cod and it seemed to work well noting that there are big bright yield signs. He noted others being developed and said that he trusts the Town Council to do their homework and make the right decisions.

Mr. Gullotta said that the dedicated right lane associated with the signalized intersection will cause more issues with traffic given more right turns. Chairman Beckett said that in 2009, the town underwent a traffic study from East Hartford to Town Hall, there have been town center meetings to discuss everything including traffic and a variety of meetings on these intersections. He continued saying that they have tried to look at the whole town but the roads are also at capacity. He said that there has to be a taking for the sidewalks so unless they take houses, there is no room for added lanes. Vice Chairman Osgood said that they have looked at traffic studies through the next seven years and House Street is actually the suggested route for vehicles seeking to get to the north end of town. He emphasized that the issue at House and Hebron is driving these projects and that a right turn only out of House is not viable. He conveyed that the state said there would be no light at House Street and they would only handle the request if the issue at New London Turnpike is handled first. He said that they will do what they think is best for the town as a whole. With no further comment, Chairman Beckett closed the public hearing.

12. Executive Session.

(a) Terms and Conditions for Potential Sale of Town Owned Property

Motion By: Mr. Cavanaugh **Seconded By:** Mr. Gullotta

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enters executive session at 9:15 pm for the purpose of discussing terms and conditions for potential sale of town owned property.

Result: Motion passes unanimously {9-0-0}.

Present for the executive session were Town Council Members: Dr. Stewart Beckett, III, Chairman, Mr. Whit C. Osgood, Vice Chairman, Mrs. Jill Barry, Ms. Karen Boisvert, Mr. Lawrence J. Byar, Mr. Kurt Cavanaugh, Mr. William Finn, Mr. Thomas P. Gullotta and Mrs. Cara Keefe with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson.

Motion By: Mr. Cavanaugh **Seconded By:** Mr. Gullotta

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby exits executive session at 10:15 pm.

Result: Motion passes unanimously {9-0-0}.

13. Adjournment

Motion By: Mr. Cavanaugh **Seconded By:** Mr. Gullotta

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adjourns their regular meeting of July 14, 2015, at 10:16 pm.

Result: Motion passes unanimously {9-0-0}.

Respectfully submitted,

Kimberly Meanix Miller

Kimberly Meanix Miller
Recording Clerk

Stewart Beckett, III
Chairman